



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,250	10/12/2001	Takuhito Ueno	110863	8843
25944 7590 05/01/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER RUDOLPH, VINCENT M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/01/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

09/975,250

**Applicant(s)**

UENO ET AL.

**Examiner**

Vincent Rudolph

**Art Unit**

2625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Vincent Rudolph.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Jon Backenstose.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wiley (US Pat. 6,594,767), Itoh (US Pat. 6,100,995) and Yang (US Pat. 5,881,335).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented arguments that distinguished the application in question over the prior arts of record, specifically the processor, included within the controller, as well as the communication interface. While the examiner believes that the prior arts, in combination, do meet each limitation of the claims, proposed claims were discussed to further distinguish over the prior arts of record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Vincent Rudolph/  
Acting Examiner of Art Unit 2625